

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Date: August 15, 2024

To: Southern California Edison Company (SCE)

From: Lisa Paulo and Peter Biermayer, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)

Cc: R.13-11-005 Service Lists

Subject: 2023 EX ANTE REVIEW (EAR) SCORING AND EVALUATION PERFORMANCE

Table of Contents

I. Summary of 2023 EAR Scores - Custom Projects and Measure Packages..... 2

II. CPUC Staff Findings 2023 Activities 3

 A. Custom Projects Review Overview 3

 B. Measure Packages Review Overview 4

III. Discussion 5

 A. Custom Projects Performance Review 5

 B. Measure Packages Performance Review..... 9

IV. The Scoring Methodology 11

 A. Measure Package Metric 1-5 Scoring Methodology 12

 B. Custom Metric 1 Scoring Methodology 12

 C. Custom Metric 2 Scoring Methodology 13

 D. Custom Metric 3, 4, and 5 Scoring Methodology 13

 E. Score Enhancement Methodology 13

Attachment A: Final EAR Performance Scores (without Enhancement Points)..... 16

Attachment B Custom Project Scores and Feedback..... 18

Attachment C: Measure Package Scores and Feedback 21

Attachment D: 2023 Performance Annual Ratings 27

I. Summary of 2023 EAR Scores - Custom Projects and Measure Packages

Pursuant to Decision (D).13-09-023, D.15-10-028, D.16-08-019, and D.20-11-013, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) staff and consultants score the investor-owned utilities (IOUs) based on their performance during the pre-approval phase (or “ex ante” phase) of developing an energy efficiency project or measure. The ex ante review (EAR) scoring is a part of the EAR awards¹. D.20-11-013 placed a moratorium on EAR awards but directed that EAR scoring shall continue. CPUC staff and consultants completed the 2023 EAR performance review scoring as prescribed in Table 3 of D.16-08-019. Decision D.16-08-019 established consolidated metrics to evaluate and further direct the utilities. Ordering Paragraph 19 of this decision states that the EAR scores “shall be weighted for the utility program administrators based on the proportion of deemed savings and custom measures in each utility’s portfolio”.

A breakdown of SCE’s 2023 EAR performance score of 84.15/100 for measure packages² and custom projects is shown below in Table 1. SCE’s 2023 total points is a 0.58 point increase from its 2022 total points of 83.69. Scores for 2022 are provided in Table 2 on the following page.

Table 1: SCE 2023 EAR Scoring for Measure Packages and Custom Projects

SCE 2023 EAR Review Performance Scores and Points		Measure Packages				Custom			
Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points
1	Timing and Timeliness of Submittals	2.34	10%	2.34	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	3.90	30%	11.69	15	4.71	30%	14.24	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	2.79	10%	2.79	5	4.90	10%	4.90	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	5.00	25%	12.50	12.5	5.00	25%	12.50	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	4.19	25%	10.48	12.5	3.13	25%	7.83	12.5
Total				39.80	50			44.47	50

¹ The EAR awards were part of the Efficiency Savings and Performance Incentive (ESPI) awards.

² A Measure Package documents the data, methodologies, and rationale used to develop values for deemed measures. A Measure Package is prepared and submitted by program administrators and approved by the CPUC.

Table 2: SCE 2022 EAR Scoring for Measure Packages and Custom Projects

SCE 2022 EAR Review Performance Scores and Points		Measure Packages				Custom			
Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points	Metric Score	Metric Weight Factor	Points	Max Points
1	Timing and Timeliness of Submittals	2.75	10%	2.75	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	2.88	30%	8.63	15	4.22	30%	12.65	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	3.00	10%	3.00	5	5.00	10%	5.00	5
4	Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness	5.00	25%	12.50	12.5	4.41	25%	11.03	12.5
5	Responsiveness to Needs for Process/Program Improvements	5.00	25%	12.50	12.5	4.25	25%	10.63	12.5
Total				39.38	50			44.31	50

The metric scoring area descriptions are expanded in [Attachment A](#). The final category scores are explained in more detail below as well as in [Attachment B](#) through [Attachment D](#) to this memo.

II. CPUC Staff Findings 2023 Activities

A. Custom Projects Review Overview

From the period beginning January 2023 to the end of December 2023, CPUC staff issued 17 scored dispositions.³

A review of the project dispositions and the Review Process Score Enhancements points⁴ resulted in SCE's custom project score increasing by 0.16 points from 2022 scores (44.31 in 2022 vs. 44.47 in 2023 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above). While SCE continues to demonstrate efforts to improve its processes, SCE must continue to work to improve its overall performance.

1. Summary of 2023 Achievements

CPUC staff's observed SCE to have improved in:

- **SCE continues to improve its processes for submitting documentation in a timely manner.** Projects were submitted on the due date, with 12 projects submitted early by ten or more days indicating SCE's processes for reducing the time for custom projects to be submitted with appropriate documentation is continuing to improve.
- **SCE continues to actively participate and take a lead role in Statewide Initiatives.** SCE was instrumental in helping lead the Statewide Coordination team, including managing the collaboration space for materials and dedicating staff resources to subgroup efforts.

³ Some of the dispositions are for projects submitted at the end of 2022. Some projects that were selected in 2023 had dispositions issued in 2023. The memo is for dispositions issued in 2023.

⁴ Section IV.E provides details on the score enhancement methodology.

- **SCE has focused on reducing the number of issues regarding program influence.** In 2022, there were 5 issues regarding program influence which comprised 15% percent of all noted issues. This was improved in 2023 with no issues related to program influence.
- **SCE has focused on reducing the number of issues regarding Process, Policy, and Program rules.** In 2022 there were 11 issues identified across 17 dispositions which comprised 32 percent of all issues identified. There were continued noted deficiencies for measure effective useful life EUL/RUL estimation. In 2023, this reduced to 2 issues identified across 17 dispositions which comprised 13 percent of all issues identified with no noted deficiencies in EUL/RUL estimation.

2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

Areas that were most problematic, frequent, and/or need improvement include:

- **The number of issues related to Gross Savings Impacts area increased.** In 2023 there were 7 issues identified across 17 dispositions which comprised 47 percent of all issues identified which is an increase from 15 percent in 2022. The deficiencies noted were related to incorrect analysis assumptions and inadequate M&V plan.

B. Measure Packages Review Overview

SCE's measure packages scores have increased compared to last year by 0.42 points (from 39.38 in 2022 to 39.80 in 2023 as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above).

1. Summary of 2023 Achievements

CPUC staff observed improvements in SCE's development and management of measure package submissions in the following areas:

- **SCE has made improvements with the quality of the measure package submittals.** Minor errors have continued to persist, but large errors impact savings, and the reduction of major errors has helped other areas of the measure package review process like timeliness.
- **SCE has continued to take a lead role in CPUC supported calculators.** The Fuel Substitution and Refrigerant Avoided Cost Calculators continue to be supported by SCE.
- **SCE has made improvements in collaborating with CPUC and review staff.** Particularly through the measure package plan process, the Statewide LED measure packages were well coordinated reviews for all stakeholders. Additionally, the measure package plan coordination has led to quicker review times for other measures like the Business Energy Reports and Software-Controlled Switch Reluctance Motor measure packages.
- **SCE should continue to provide coordination and communication on sunseting measures.** There has been a recent focus on sunseting measure packages due to low uptake or eligibility reasons with the addition of the Sunset List on eTRM.

2. Summary of Areas Requiring Improvement

CPUC staff highlights the following recommendations for improvement:

- **There is room for more improvement in the QA/QC process for measure packages.** SCE should continue to focus and improve upon the existing QA/QC review processes for measure packages. While critical comments on measure packages were less frequent in 2023, there were many measures with typos and readability concerns.
- **There is room for improvement in the measure package timeliness.** SCE submitted twelve DEER2024 measure package revisions in the last week of December. While most of these measures were officially approved in the 2024 calendar year and will be scored in next year's EAR memo, this delay is worth noting as a feed-forward item in the 2023 EAR memo.
- **SCE should focus on cover sheet QC in 2024.** With the enhancement to integrate the cover sheet to the eTRM in the Fall of 2023, there should be more focus on providing more detail in the cover sheet than what the eTRM automatically provides when measure package changes lead to substantial changes to savings.

III. Discussion

The following sections of this memorandum provide a detailed description of the findings, including, areas of achievement, areas requiring improvement and scoring for both custom projects and measure packages.

A. Custom Projects Performance Review

Each year, CPUC staff reviews a selected sample of energy efficiency program custom project applications. The review findings and directions to the PA are presented in documents referred to as "dispositions".

From the period beginning January 2023 to the end of December 2023, 17 SCE projects received dispositions. The comments below are organized by the five metric areas of scoring prescribed in D.16-08-019 with metric scores shown prior to any enhancement points. A summary table of all issued dispositions is included in [Attachment B](#). [Attachment D](#) contains an embedded custom scores workbook that includes a tab with details on the individual project level disposition scores and feedback from the project reviewer.

Table 3 below presents the custom disposition points given to SCE for each metric both with and without the addition of any Enhancement Points.

Table 3: SCE 2023 Custom Disposition Points Awarded by Metric

Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Weight Factor		Max Points
		With Enhance Pts ⁵	w/o Enhance Pts	
1	Timeliness of Submittals	10%	5.00	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	14.24	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	4.90	5
4	PA's Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	12.50	12.5
5	PA's Responsiveness	25%	7.83	12.5
Total			44.47	50

1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2023, SCE received a custom disposition score of 5.0 out of 5.0 for Metric 1 (Timeliness of Submittals) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. This disposition score was based on the 17 custom project reviews completed in 2023. In 2023, SCE submitted project documentation for review for all 17 reviewed projects on time and 12 projects were submitted ten days or earlier than required per timeline mandated in Senate Bill (SB) 1131 and Section 381.2 of the Public Utilities Code.⁶ SCE continues to exceed expectations with regards to timeliness by submitting projects on time and ahead of the required due date in many cases.

2. Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions

In 2023, SCE received a custom disposition score of 14.24 out of 15.0 for Metric 2 (Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. This disposition score was based on the completeness of the 17 SCE custom project reviews. Of the 17 projects with dispositions, 2 projects (12 percent) were approved without exception and 9 projects (53 percent) had deficiencies such as incorrect calculation or analysis assumptions and missing documentation. The remaining six projects were SEM projects that have Advisory only dispositions during the mid-year submittal.

Table 4 summarizes the 13 action items identified across 17 scored dispositions⁷ issued between January 1, 2023, and December 31, 2023. These action items illustrate errors that impacted the project's net savings, documentation, and efficiency savings estimate calculations.

⁵ Section IV.E provides details on the score enhancement methodology.

⁶ "The electrical corporation or gas corporation shall make the project application supporting documentation available to the CPUC for review within 15 business days of the CPUC review selection date".

⁷ This table includes action items issued on 4 Advisory dispositions.

Table 4: Summary of Categorized Action Items for Custom Projects

Issue Area	Action Categories	Summary of CPUC Staff Required Action ⁸ by the PA:	Summary of CPUC Staff Notes or Instructions ⁹ :	Percent of Total Actions
Issues Related to Gross Savings Impacts	Analysis assumptions	4	4	31%
	Calculation method	0	5	0%
	M&V plan	3	0	23%
	Subtotals	7	9	54%
Process, Policy, Program Rules	Baseline	0	1	0%
	ER preponderance of evidence	0	1	0%
	Self-generation	2	0	15%
	Subtotals	2	2	15%
Documentation Issues	Continue Document Upload	0	12	0%
	Missing documents	0	1	0%
	Subtotals	0	13	0%
Issues Related to Net Impacts	Program influence	0	0	0%
	Subtotals	0	0	0%
Other Issues	Other 1 - Customer standard practice	1	0	8%
	Other 2 - Changes to service agreements	1	0	8%
	Other 3 - Incorrect model approach	1	0	8%
	Other 4 - Provide additional details for top-down model	1	0	8%
	Other 5 - Incentives for NMEC project paid 12 months after application	0	1	0%
	Subtotals	4	1	31%
	Grand Total	13	25	100%

Specific examples of project and measure level deficiencies are provided below.

- **CPR 862** had 9 (60 percent) out of 15 deficiencies identified across all 17 projects receiving dispositions which resulted in a reduction in points for this metric. The deficiencies were related to analysis assumptions, self-generation and M&V plan.
- **Incorrect Analysis Assumptions/M&V Plan** was found in 3 out of the 17 projects receiving dispositions which resulted in a reduction in points for this metric. Sampled projects containing this deficiency were CPUC Project IDs 862, 864 and 902.

⁸ For Action items, the PA must make revisions or changes as noted in CPUC Staff's review comments before signed agreement with customer.

⁹ Notes or Instructions are informational observations that do not require revision by the PA but should be considered for similar projects moving forward. They may also include documentation of pre-installation items to inform possible post-installation review(s). They are typically minor suggestions or clarifications that should not affect ESPI scoring.

3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2023, SCE received a custom disposition score of 4.4 out of 5.0 for Metric 3 (Proactive Initiative of Collaboration) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. At the portfolio level, SCE made a significant effort to bring measures, projects, and studies forward for discussion prior to CPUC staff review and active with early opinion requests on bi-weekly calls. Two of the Early Opinions demonstrated a proactive approach to clarifying CPUC policy around SEM projects which were then shared with the statewide reporting Project Coordination Group (PCG).

SCE continues to demonstrate leadership abilities by leading the Statewide Monthly Coordination meetings and, particularly with helping to resolve problems that have the potential to impact all PAs, such as SEM programs, lighting NTG, lighting standard practice, and MLC inconsistencies. SCE continues to dedicate resources to prioritizing statewide initiatives, actively participating in monthly meetings, and sharing new initiatives. These actions demonstrate performance that exceeds CPUC staff's expectations compared to what is expected to demonstrate minimum proactive collaboration.

4. PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control (QA/QC)

In 2023, SCE received a custom disposition score of 12.06 out of 12.5 for Metric 4 (PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. Project and measure level disposition performance results reviewed under Metric 2 were used as a proxy for the level of QA/QC occurring by the PA. Of the 17 projects reviewed in 2023, 2 projects (12 percent) proceeded without exception, six of the projects (35 percent) were SEM mid year reviews and so did not have any exceptions, 9 projects (53 percent) were allowed to proceed with exceptions as noted, and 0 projects were rejected. CPUC staff found that SCE had strong QC processes for 3rd party reviewers. However, most projects reviewed had exceptions noted, indicating that the QC processes are still in need of improvement.

CPUC staff acknowledges the efforts by SCE to continually update and streamline their internal review process by implementing procedures for parallel reviews, peer reviews of all applications, early screening, custom solution code, Engineering Services Notice of Policy, Program, and Infrastructure changes (E-PPICs), and by uploading dispositions to the CAEnergyGuidance.com.

5. PA's Responsiveness

In 2023, SCE received a custom disposition score of 7.83 out of 12.5 for Metric 5 (PA's Responsiveness) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. When reviewed at the portfolio level, CPUC staff assessed the time series of rejections and expectations, the alignment of program policy and procedures with the number of actual rejections and exceptions based on eligibility and attribution, and the adaption to changes in rules over time. CPUC staff notes a decrease in the submission of custom projects that fall outside of the SEM program. Of the 7 projects with dispositions in the second half of the year, six were SEM projects with Advisory dispositions. As such, there are no project exceptions expected for these mid-year reviews.

B. Measure Packages Performance Review

SCE submitted 41 measure packages in 2023, 17 were reviewed and disposed, and the remaining 24 are still under detailed review into 2024. This end of year memo provides measure package specific feedback on the 17 which were reviewed and disposed.

The comments below are organized by the five scoring metric areas created in D.16-08-019.¹⁰ The narrative includes observations common to multiple measure packages and feedback related to the measure package development process. Specific measure package feedback is provided in Attachment C at the end of this document. The Measure Package Detailed Review Table provides feedback on specific measure packages. The Measure Package Submissions Table lists all measure packages submitted by SCE or SCE measure packages that were disposed during the review period. Measure packages were selected for feedback from those that were submitted by SCE and were either disposed or reached approval status during the review period. CPUC staff acknowledges that measure package development may have been supported by multiple PAs; however, at this time, there is no mechanism for apportioning feedback among PAs. Therefore, feedback is only provided for the submitting PA, with the assumption that they are the lead PA. The scoring rubric for measure packages is defined as follows:

‘+’ indicates a positive scoring impact which receives 100% of total points for the metric

‘-’ indicates a negative scoring impact which receives 0% of total points for the metric

‘Yes’ indicates meeting minimum expectation which receives 50% of total points for the metric

‘No’ indicates the review feedback is not applicable to a metric and does not impact the average

The assigned percentage scores were averaged across all the reviewed items.

Table 5 below presents the measure package disposition points given to SCE for each metric both with and without the addition of any enhancement points.

Table 5: SCE Measure Package Disposition Points Awarded by Metric

Metric	Metric Area of Scoring	Weight Factor	Measure Package Disposition Points		Max Points
			With Enhance Pts ¹¹	w/o Enhance Pts	
1	Timeliness of Submittals	10%	2.34	2.34	5
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals	30%	11.69	7.94	15
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration	10%	2.79	2.79	5
4	PA’s Due Diligence and QA/QC	25%	12.50	6.99	12.5
5	PA’s Responsiveness	25%	10.48	7.35	12.5
			39.80	27.41	50

¹⁰ See [D.16-08-019](#) at 87.

¹¹ Section IV.E provides details on the score enhancement methodology.

1. Timeliness of Submittals

In 2023, SCE received a measure package disposition score of 2.34 out of 5.0 for Metric 1 (Timeliness of Submittals) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SCE has largely met deadlines for submission of statewide measure packages in the review period, and most measure packages received a 'Yes', indicating that minimum expectations were met for timeliness. However, there were an increased number of measure packages in 2023 that had delayed measure package submissions such as the Fan Controller for Air Conditioner and the Deck Oven measure packages. The Hot Food Holding Cabinet measure package received a (+) for early submission and expedited eTRM comment review.

2. Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions

In 2023, SCE received a measure package disposition score of 7.94 out of 15.0 for Metric 2 (Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submissions) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SCE has improved on the quality and completeness of measure package submittals in 2023 with most measure packages only consisting of a few minor clarifying comments and less typos. The Fan Controller for Air Conditioner measure package was approved without comment. There were no measure packages that were submitted under the minimum quality content standards.

3. Proactive Initiative of Collaboration

In 2023, SCE received a measure package disposition score of 2.79 out of 5.0 for Metric 3 (Proactive Initiative of Collaboration) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. Most of the submittals received a yes and met minimum expectations. SCE has proactively engaged with CPUC during the development of new Business Energy Reports measure package. Additionally, SCE had a received above and beyond scores for the Software Controlled Switch Reluctance Motor measure package with a well-documented measure package plan and measure package submission to add new accelerated replacement offerings. All other submissions met the minimum standard for collaboration.

4. PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control

In 2023, SCE received a measure package disposition score of 6.99 out of 12.5 for Metric 4 (PA's Due Diligence, Quality Assurance, and Quality Control) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SCE has improved the quality of the measure package submittals since 2022. Two of the measure packages received a '+' indicating they exceeded the minimum expectation. Measure packages were updated with minimal errors, especially the Commercial Fryer and Heat Pump Pool Heater Fuel Substitution measure packages. An extra component of these submittals was to include the mapping to the new eTRM permutation fields, which were well documented.

5. PA's Responsiveness

In 2023, SCE received a measure package disposition score of 7.35 out of 12.5 for Metric 5 (PA's Responsiveness) prior to the addition of any enhancement points. SCE effectively responded to program needs with the new eTRM permutation fields for the Anti-Sweat Heater Controls and Commercial Hand-Wrap Machine measure packages. All other measure packages met minimum expectations. CPUC staff and consultants have regularly and productively engaged with SCE and continue to rely on them to provide answers for the electric measure packages.

IV. The Scoring Methodology

The 2023 performance score was developed using five detailed scoring metrics for each directly reviewed work product (i.e., measure package and custom project), as well as a scoring of the utility's internal due diligence processes, QA/QC procedures and methods, as well as program implementation enhancements to support improved forecasted values.

[Attachment A](#) summarizes the Metrics adopted in D.16-08-019 as well as the CPUC staff-developed scores and points for 2023. D.16-08-019 also directed that the custom and measure package scores be weighted together into a final score based on the IOU total claims for custom and deemed activities, respectively.

In accordance with D.13-09-023, the PA's activities are assessed against a set of five metrics on a rating scale of 1 to 5. Once activities are assessed, the ratings for each are converted onto this scale, where 1 is the lowest score assigned and 5 is the highest score assigned. A maximum score on all metrics for both measure packages and custom projects will yield 100 points whereas a minimum score on all metrics would yield 20 points. The 1 to 5 rating scale is distinguished as follows:

1. Consistent underperformer in meeting the basic expectations.
2. Makes a minimal effort to meet CPUC expectations but needs dramatic improvement.
3. Makes effort to meet CPUC expectations, however improvement is required.
4. Sometimes exceeds CPUC expectations while some improvement is expected.
5. Consistently exceeds CPUC expectations.

As with the 2022 performance scores, the final scores were “built-up” from a metric-by-metric assessment of each reviewed work product. It is CPUC staff's expectation that this detailed scoring approach, along with the detailed qualitative measure package and custom project level feedback, is consistent with the direction provided in D.13-09-023. We believe this scoring approach provides specific guidance to the utilities on how to improve their due diligence review and scores moving forward.

A “Direct Work Product Review” portion of each metric score was developed based upon the individual scoring of dispositions issued for custom project or measure packages. Each reviewed utility work product was first determined to have components either applicable or not applicable to a metric.¹² If a metric was determined to be not applicable to a given disposition, the metric was identified as not applicable (“N/A”), and the metric was assigned a score equal to the average 1 to 5 score from the remaining applicable metrics. Assigning this average score to any “N/A” metrics essentially normalized the final score so that a disposition neither benefitted nor was penalized because of a non-applicable metric.

For custom projects, each applicable metric was directly scored according to the unique metric

¹² An example is the No Savings procedural measure package, which does not include any savings, costs, or permutations and therefore would not receive scoring for Metric 2 (“Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittal”). Another example would be a minor measure package which may not require proactive collaboration with CPUC staff and therefore not receive a score for Metric 3 (“Proactive Initiation of Collaboration”).

scoring methodology outlined below. A project-by-project summary of the custom project scoring is included in a custom tables workbook which has been included as an embedded Excel file in [Attachment D](#).

A. Measure Package Metric 1-5 Scoring Methodology

For measure packages, if an item was determined to have activity applicable to a metric, the item was then assigned a qualitative rating as to the level of due diligence applied to the item. The scoring rubric for Measure Packages is defined as follows:

- ‘+’ indicates a positive scoring impact which receives 100% of total points for the metric
- ‘-’ indicates a negative scoring impact which receives 0% of total points for the metric
- ‘Yes’ indicates meeting minimum expectation which receives 50% of total points for the metric
- ‘No’ indicates the review feedback is not applicable to a metric and does not impact the average

The assigned percentage scores were averaged across all the reviewed items. Individual measure package level disposition scoring, as well as related measure package activities, are provided in [Attachment C](#). Note the following approach to scoring individual measure packages by metric:

- Metric 1 Timeliness: The measure package submission schedule was designed to distribute the measure packages throughout the year. measure packages receive “+” if schedule was followed.
- Metric 2 Content: Straightforward measure package received a “Yes”, complex revisions received a “+”, unless there were errors in the content, which warranted a “-”.
- Metric 3 Collaboration: Straightforward consolidation effort measure package received a “Yes”, initiative to work with other PAs and CPUC receives “+”.
- Metric 4 Quality Assurance: Measure packages that were complete, consistent, and without meaningful errors received a “Yes”. Those measure packages with inconsistencies between the data tables and narrative or where values were left undefined received a “-” score.
- Metric 5 Process: Measure package responsiveness to program needs received a “Yes” for straightforward and “+” for complex measure package submissions.

B. Custom Metric 1 Scoring Methodology

This metric is related to the timeliness of submittals and a maximum of five points is allocated to this metric based on the PA’s responsiveness to requests and follow-up documentation required to complete the review. Scoring for this metric occurs at the individual project review stage.

Per Senate Bill (SB) 1131 requirement an allocation of 15 business days is given for the PA to submit materials following the date selected for review. PAs begin with a score of 5 and after 15 business days have passed, 1.0 point is deducted for each day the submittal is late.

C. Custom Metric 2 Scoring Methodology

This metric is related to content and completeness of submittals and a maximum of 15 points is allocated to this metric. Scoring occurs on each custom project during the individual project review stage. On a percentage basis Metric 2 is the single greatest determinant of the overall EAR score. Scoring for Metric 2 is achieved through numerous areas throughout the custom project review workbook. PA's begin with a full score of 5 for each custom project in the review workbook with each noted deficiency reducing the points accordingly. Deficiencies are not weighted equally, with significant issues such as failure of the fuel substitution test or inadequate documentation of program influence receiving a heavier weighting compared to tests such as incorrect site location information. The scores from all custom projects are then averaged together to arrive at an average disposition score for Metric 2.

D. Custom Metric 3, 4, and 5 Scoring Methodology

Whereas Metrics 1 and 2 are assessed at the project level, Metrics 3 and 5 are assessed at the portfolio level for each PA. As such, no individual custom project receives a unique score for these metrics. Additionally, unlike Metrics 1 and 2 which rely on deductions under each metric, scores for Metrics 3 and 5 are awarded based on the PA's performance as it relates to the components of each metric.

For Metric 3, points are awarded when the PA proactively brought high impact or unique projects forward to CPUC staff prior to developing a study or project. The final score for Metric 3 is therefore representative of the average performance of custom projects across the portfolio of projects.

Scoring for Metric 4 relies upon disposition results and findings identified under Metric 2 as well as the overall depth and correctness of the technical review team. The PA's performance on dispositions assists in serving as a proxy for quality control under Metric 4. In addition, several project specific elements such as whether changing market practices and updates to DEER were considered, or if a project demonstrated evidence of review activities are used to assess the scoring for this metric. Like Metric 3, a final score is representative of the average performance of custom projects across the portfolio of projects.

With Metric 5, a review of process enhancement tools and techniques, tracking improved disposition performance over time, and highlights provided throughout the year by the PA assist in determining an average score related to process and programmatic improvements. Like Metrics 3 and 4, a final score is representative of the average performance of custom projects across the portfolio of projects.

E. Score Enhancement Methodology

The above process resulted in custom project and measure package work product review scores. Next, PA-specific "Review Process Score Enhancements" were developed for each applicable metric based on observed policy and technical reviews or program implementation processes/procedures developed and implemented in 2023 to positively impact future project

reviews. CPUC staff believes it is important to provide EAR “Enhancement” points for positive due diligence developments to recognize the effort and to provide additional encouragement even before a change in project-level results is observed.

In the custom scoring process, CPUC staff decided that SCE’s efforts did rise to the level to be awarded “Enhancement” points.

- Metric 1 Timeliness: No adder points for Metric 1.
- Metric 2 Content: No adder points for Metric 2.
- Metric 3 Collaboration: Facilitation of statewide Sharepoint and monthly meeting.
- Metric 4 Due Diligence: Proactive discussion on needs for lighting standard practice study in anticipation of 2024 MLC update.
- Metric 5 Process: No adder points for Metric 5.

Measure package scores also include “Review Process Score Enhancements.” Process issues represent critical deemed measure development topics where CPUC staff believes improvement is needed or improvement has occurred, but those activities are not necessarily reflected in the areas of direct review. These activities, as discussed above, are noted in the narrative, and are summarized here by metric as:

- Metric 1 Timeliness: No adder points for Metric 1.
- Metric 2 Content: SCE has continued to support the CPUC with the development of DEER tables and guidance document support. SCE has provided support in the preponderance of evidence and Title 24 guidance document development in addition to building type definitions for the Deemed Rulebook. Additionally, SCE has provided EnergyPlus support for the grocery prototype.
- Metric 3 Collaboration: No adder points for Metric 3.
- Metric 4 Due Diligence: SCE has continued to support the CPUC with the development of the Fuel Substitution Calculator and Refrigerant Avoided Cost Calculators. SCE has worked with E3 to provide CPUC staff assistance in review, effectiveness, and policy considerations.
- Metric 5 Process: SCE has continued to support the CPUC with the development of DEER tables and guidance document support. SCE has provided support in the preponderance of evidence and Title 24 guidance document development in addition to building type definitions for the Deemed Rulebook. Additionally, SCE has provided EnergyPlus support for the grocery prototype.

To produce the final measure package scores, the metric scores for the two measure package contributing areas were added together, using a 50 percent weight for the process issues score. The 50 percent weight given to the process review has the effect of being a “score enhancement” or increase to the direct review score. Furthermore, within each contributing area (direct and process review areas), CPUC staff also assigned weights for individual items as a way to reflect greater importance of different individual review items. The separate process scoring provides an avenue

for assessing overall QA/QC processes and procedures put into place by SCE.¹³

[Attachment D](#) contains custom and measure package summary tables showing the components and total scores and points for each metric in each of the two component areas of scoring described above.

Questions or comments about the feedback or final scores should be directed to Lisa Paulo (lisa.paulo@cpuc.ca.gov) or Peter Biermayer (peter.biermayer@cpuc.ca.gov). Note that pursuant to D.13-09-023, CPUC staff will schedule a meeting with SCE staff to discuss this memorandum and its final scores by April 30, 2024.

¹³ The guidance on scoring approach provided in D.13-09-023, at 74, provides that when only a small number of submissions are available for scoring and the submissions have varying impacts on the portfolio overall, that appropriate weighting should be allied to the submission and observed performance that should carry across multiple metrics. “Low scores for metrics that assess specific and important quantities (e.g., if the utility only uploads a small percentage of custom projects and receives a low score for Metric 1), will have a proportional impact on the total score the utility could receive for later metrics that measure the quality of custom project submittals.” “For example, doing an outstanding job on a large number of very low-impact, standardized projects will not make up for doing a poor job on a few projects that represent a major portion of portfolio dollars.”

Attachment A: Final EAR Performance Scores (without Enhancement Points)

Metric	Measure Packages				Custom							
	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2023 Score	2023 Points	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2023 Score	2023 Points				
1	Timing and Timeliness of Submittals				5	10%	2.34	2.34	5	10%	5.00	5.00
	Timely submittals: all lists, inventories, plans, studies, Measure Packages and project/measure documentation; timing and advanced announcement of submittals (spreading out submission when available rather than holding and turning in large batches); timely follow-up PA responses to review disposition action items including intention to submit/re-submit with proposed schedule.											
2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals				15	30%	2.65	7.94	15	30%	4.75	14.24
	Completeness, appropriateness, comprehensiveness, accuracy, and clarity of submittals. Submittal adherence to CPUC policies, Decisions, and prior CPUC staff dispositions and/or guidance. Do the submittals include all materials required to support the submittal proposed values, methods and results. Is the project or measure clearly articulated. Are proposed or utilized methods clearly explained including step-by-step method or procedure descriptions. Will the proposed or utilized approach provide accurate results. Are all relevant related or past activities and submittals appropriately noted or disclosed, analyzed or discussed. Are the pros/cons of alternate possible approaches or conclusions discussed to support that the chosen one is most appropriate.											
3	Proactive Initiative of Collaboration				5	10%	2.79	2.79	5	10%	4.40	4.40
	PA efforts to bring either measures, projects, studies, questions, and/or savings calculation methods and tools to CPUC staff for discussion in the early formative stages, before CPUC staff review selection. In the case of tools, before widespread use in the programs. CPUC staff expects collaboration among the PAs to develop common or coordinated submissions and for the PAs to undertake joint or coordinated planning activities and study work. The PAs are expected to engage with CPUC staff in early discussions on unique or high profile, high impact measures or projects before program or customer commitments are made. The PAs are expected to engage with CPUC staff on planning and execution of studies that support proposed offerings, tools, or determination of proposed baselines or other programmatic assumption that can impact ex ante values to be utilized.											
4	Program Administrator's Due Diligence and Quality Assurance/Quality Control Effectiveness				12.5	25%	2.79	6.99	12.5	25%	4.85	12.12

Metric	Measure Packages				Custom			
	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2023 Score	2023 Points	Max Points	Max Percent of Total Points	2023 Score	2023 Points
CPUC staff expects the PA to have effective Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) processes for their programs and measures. The PAs are expected to have a pro-active approach to reviewing existing measure and project assumptions, methods and values and updating those to take into account changes in market offerings, standard practice, updates to DEER methods and assumptions, changes to codes, standards and regulations, and other factors that warrant such updates. The depth and correctness of the PA's technical review of their ex ante parameters and values, for both Core, Local Government and Third Party programs, are included under this metric. The depth and correctness of the PA's technical review of their own staff and subcontractor work related to supporting deemed and custom measure and project submissions are included in this metric. Evidence of review activities is expected to be visible in submissions so that CPUC staff can evaluate the effectiveness of the PA internal QA/QC processes.								
5 Program Administrator's Responsiveness to Needs for Process and Program Improvements	12.5	25%	2.94	7.35	12.5	25%	3.13	7.83
This metric reflects the PAs ongoing efforts to improve their internal processes and procedures resulting in increased ex post evaluated gross and net savings impacts. CPUC staff looks not only to the PA's internal QC/QA processes, but also whether individual programs and their supporting activities incorporate and comply with CPUC policies and prior CPUC staff disposition guidance in their program rules, policies, procedures and reporting. This includes changes to program rules, offerings and internal operations and processes required to improve overall review and evaluation results.								
Total	50	100%		27.41	50	100%		43.59

Attachment B Custom Project Scores and Feedback

The table below lists the identification numbers associated with each disposition. All custom projects were scored using new metrics adopted in 2016. The metrics are shown in the Table below.

Table 4 2016 Adopted Performance Metrics

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted Performance Metrics	Maximum Points	% of Total Points
Metric 1	Timeliness and Timing of Submittals Timely submittal of all documentation and follow-up utility responses to review disposition action items.	5.0	10%
Metric 2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals Completeness, appropriateness, comprehensiveness, accuracy, and clarity of submitted documentation. In addition, this metric is an assessment of the utility's adherence to CPUC policies, Decisions, and prior CPUC staff disposition guidance.	15.0	30%
Metric 3	Proactive Initiation of Collaboration Utility's efforts to bring either measures, questions, and/or savings calculation tools to CPUC staff for discussion in the early formative stages, before CPUC staff review selection. In the case of tools, before widespread use in the programs. CPUC staff expects collaboration among the utilities and for the program administrators to engage with CPUC staff in early discussions on high profile, high impact measures well before customer commitments are made.	5.0	10%
Metric 4	Utility Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness CPUC staff expects the utility to have effective Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) processes for its programs and measures. The depth and correctness of the utility's technical review of its ex ante parameters and values, for both Core and Third Party programs, are included under this metric.	12.5	25%
Metric 5	Utility Responsiveness to Needs for Process & Program Improvements (Course Corrections) This metric reflects the utility's efforts to improve, operationalize, and improve its internal processes which are responsible for the creation and assignment of ex ante parameters and values. CPUC staff looks not only to the utility's internal QC/QA process, but also whether individual programs incorporate and comply with CPUC policies and prior CPUC staff disposition guidance in its program rules, policies, and procedures.	12.5	25%

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted ex ante Metrics	Maximum Points	% of Total Points	Total Scored Points	# of Scored Dispositions	Scoring Notes (Portfolio Level ¹⁴)
Metric 1	Timeliness and Timing of Submittals Timely submittal of all documentation and follow-up utility responses to review disposition action items.	5	10%	5.00	17	SCE complied with SB1131 guidelines for submitting documentation before the 15 business days required. No projects were found to be late and 12 projects were submitted early by 10 or more days, indicating that SCE is consistently exceeding expectations with regards to timeliness.
Metric 2	Content, Completeness, and Quality of Submittals Completeness, appropriateness, comprehensiveness, accuracy, and clarity of submitted documentation. In addition, this metric is an assessment of the utility's adherence to CPUC policies, Decisions, and prior CPUC staff disposition guidance.	15	30%	14.06	17	In 2023, of the 17 projects with dispositions 2 projects (12 percent) were approved without exception and six of the projects (35 percent), though Advisory only, did not have any exceptions. CPUC staff found that the remaining 9 projects (53 percent) had deficiencies such as incorrect calculation or analysis assumptions and missing documentation.
Metric 3	Proactive Initiation of Collaboration Utility's efforts to bring either measures, questions, and/or savings calculation tools to CPUC staff for discussion in the early formative stages, before CPUC staff review selection. In the case of tools, before widespread use in the programs. CPUC staff expects collaboration among the utilities and for the program administrators to engage with CPUC staff in early discussions on high profile, high impact measures well before customer commitments are made.	5	10%	5.00	17	Commission Staff found that SCE made significant efforts to bring measures, projects, or studies forward for discussion prior to review. In addition, they took an active and engaged lead in statewide collaboration efforts and were champions of several statewide initiatives. Staff found SCE to be highly active during bi-weekly calls and took a leadership role in resolving problems that affected all PAs.
Metric 4	Utility Due Diligence and QA/QC Effectiveness CPUC staff expects the utility to have effective Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) processes for its programs and measures. The depth and correctness of the utility's technical review of its ex ante parameters and values, for both Core and Third Party programs, are included under this metric.	12.5	25%	12.50	17	Commission staff weighted the number of dispositions proceeding without exception against those that required resubmissions or resulted in rejections. Of the 17 projects reviewed in 2023, 2 projects (12 percent) proceeded without exception, six of the projects (35 percent), though Advisory only, did not have any exceptions and 9 projects (53 percent) were allowed to proceed with exceptions as noted, and 0 projects were rejected. Commission staff found that SCE had strong QC processes for 3rd party reviewers.

¹⁴ The Metric 1, 2, and 4 scores for each of the individual custom projects are included in the final custom workbook which is embedded in Attachment D.

Metric	2016 CPUC Adopted ex ante Metrics	Maximum Points	% of Total Points	Total Scored Points	# of Scored Dispositions	Scoring Notes (Portfolio Level ¹⁴)
Metric 5	Utility Responsiveness to Needs for Process & Program Improvements (Course Corrections) This metric reflects the utility's efforts to improve, operationalize, and improve its internal processes which are responsible for the creation and assignment of ex ante parameters and values. CPUC staff looks not only to the utility's internal QC/QA process, but also whether individual programs incorporate and comply with CPUC policies and prior CPUC staff disposition guidance in its program rules, policies, and procedures.	12.5	25%	7.83	17	CPUC noted that the second half of the year of the 7 projects submitted 6 were SEM projects with Advisory only dispositions. As such, there are no project exceptions expected for these mid-year review.

Attachment C: Measure Package Scores and Feedback

The table below lists the ID numbers associated with each Measure Package submission or disposition and the Measure Package review process “score enhancements” scoring area. The listed weight is used in the combining all the individual rows together into a single score for all the rows in the two scoring components (“direct review” and “process issues”); then each category total score gets equal weighting in the final total score for the metric. The IOU may refer to the individual dispositions for more detailed descriptions of the specific actions staff required for each Measure Package. The qualitative EAR scoring feedbacks are designated as follows:

- ‘+’ indicates a positive (from midpoint) scoring impact on a metric,
- ‘-’ indicates a negative (from midpoint) scoring impact on a metric,
- ‘Yes’ indicates meeting expectation; neutral (midpoint) scoring impact on a metric,
- ‘No’ indicates the review feedback is not applicable to a metric.

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages					EAR Metrics				
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SWWB007	1	Business Energy Reports	New measure package submission. Clarifying comments on permutation category and sub-category values and statistical methodology. Detailed review on survey-based approach and randomized controlled trial methodology. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	no	yes	+	yes	yes
SWWH025	6	Heat Pump Water Heater, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Mid-cycle measure package submission to add upsizing measures. Clarifying comments on building vintage permutation values and eligibility requirements. One minor text comment to include language on first hour rating details. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	+
SWHC041	4	Software-Controlled Switch Reluctance Motor	Mid-cycle measure package submission to add accelerated replacement offerings. Clarifying comments on building vintage values, variation in efficiencies within the eligibility horsepower range, cost assumptions, and minor text edits in the Title 24 code section. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	+	yes	yes
SWHC044	3	Ductless HVAC, Residential, Fuel Substitution	DEER2023 measure package update and SEER to SEER2 code-based revision. Minor text edit comments. Clarifying comments on data collection requirements and building vintage values. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWHC045	2	Heat Pump HVAC, Residential, Fuel Substitution	DEER2023 measure package update and SEER to SEER2 code-based revision. Minor text edit comments. Clarifying comments on data collection requirements, building vintage values, preponderance of evidence language, and RACC tables in the measure package. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages					EAR Metrics				
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SWFS007	4	Insulated Hot Food Holding Cabinet	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comment on the operating hours per day. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	+	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWAP014	3	Heat Pump Clothes Dryer, Residential, Fuel Substitution	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comments on measure eligibility and building vintage section. Minor edits on updating an outdated reference. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWAP011	4	Vending and Beverage Merchandise Controller	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comments on building vintage language and confusing language in the savings section discussing effective full load hours. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWFS022	3	Convection Oven, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comments on building vintage language and data collection requirements. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWHC029	4	Fan Controller for Air Conditioner, Residential	DEER2024 measure package revision. Measure package approved without comment.	1	-	+	yes	yes	yes
SWAP013	3	Cooking Appliances, Residential, Fuel Substitution	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comments on building vintage language and the data collection requirements sections. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWCR001	4	Anti-Sweat Heater Controls	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comment on the building vintage language. One minor narrative update in the lifecycle section. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	+
SWFS009	3	Deck Oven, Electric, Commercial	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comment on the building vintage language. One minor narrative update in the data collection requirements section. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	-	yes	yes	yes	yes
SWFS010	3	Commercial Hand-Wrap Machine, Electric	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comments on the building vintage and eligibility section. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	+
SWFS021	4	Fryer, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comment on the building vintage language. One minor narrative update in the data collection requirements section. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	+	yes
SWRE005	3	Heat Pump Pool Heater, Residential, Fuel Substitution	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comment on the building vintage language. One minor narrative update in the data collection requirements section. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	+	yes

Measure Package Reviews – Scored Measure Packages						EAR Metrics				
MP ID	Rev	Title	Comments	Weight	1	2	3	4	5	
SWPR004	4	Circulating Block Heater	DEER2024 measure package revision. Clarifying comments on the measure application types. One minor narrative update in the data collection requirements section. Measure package approved after comment response review.	1	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	

Measure Package and Measure Package Plan Submission Status – All Measure Packages and Plans submitted in 2023

MP ID	Rev	Title	Submission Status
SWWB007	1	Business Energy Reports	Interim approval.
SWWH025	6	Heat Pump Water Heater, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWHC041	4	Software-Controlled Switch Reluctance Motor	Interim approval.
SWHC044	3	Ductless HVAC, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWHC045	2	Heat Pump HVAC, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWFS007	4	Insulated Hot Food Holding Cabinet	Interim approval.
SWAP014	3	Heat Pump Clothes Dryer, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWAP011	4	Vending and Beverage Merchandise Controller	Interim approval.
SWFS022	3	Convection Oven, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWHC029	4	Fan Controller for Air Conditioner, Residential	Interim approval.
SWAP013	3	Cooking Appliances, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWCR001	4	Anti-Sweat Heater Controls	Interim approval.
SWFS009	3	Deck Oven, Electric, Commercial	Interim approval.
SWFS010	3	Commercial Hand-Wrap Machine, Electric	Interim approval.
SWFS021	4	Fryer, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWRE005	3	Heat Pump Pool Heater, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Interim approval.
SWPR004	4	Circulating Block Heater	Interim approval.
SWHC044	4	Ductless HVAC, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Detailed review in progress.
SWCR002	4	Low-Temperature Display Case Doors with No Anti-Sweat Heaters	Detailed review in progress.
SWCR022	4	Efficient Adiabatic Condenser	Detailed review in progress.
SWHC045	3	Heat Pump HVAC, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Detailed review in progress.
SWHC030	4	Whole House Fan, Residential	Detailed review in progress.
SWCR010	4	Bare Suction Line Insulation	Detailed review in progress.
SWHC041	5	Software-Controlled Switch Reluctance Motor	Detailed review in progress.
SWWH014	5	Heat Pump Water Heater, Residential	Detailed review in progress.
SWCR014	4	Medium or Low-Temperature Display Case	Detailed review in progress.

Measure Package and Measure Package Plan Submission Status – All Measure Packages and Plans submitted in 2023

MP ID	Rev	Title	Submission Status
SWCR008	4	Floating Suction Controls, Multiplex	Detailed review in progress.
SWCR003	3	Fan Motor Retrofit for a Refrigerated Display Case	Detailed review in progress.
SWHC039	7	Smart Thermostat, Residential	Detailed review in progress.
SWWH031	3	Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial	Detailed review in progress.
SWWH025	7	Heat Pump Water Heater, Residential, Fuel Substitution	Detailed review in progress.
SWWH027	4	Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Detailed review in progress.
SWCA001	4	VFD Retrofit for Air Compressor	Detailed review in progress.
SWFS023	3	Contact Conveyor Toaster, Commercial	Detailed review in progress.
SWHC024	4	Cogged V-Belt for HVAC Fan, Commercial	Detailed review in progress.
SWFS016	3	Refrigerated Chef Base	Detailed review in progress.
SWHC012	3	HVAC Occupancy Sensor, Classroom	Detailed review in progress.
SWHC042	4	Evaporative Pre-Cooler System and Controls for Packaged HVAC Unit	Detailed review in progress.
SWWH028	3	Large Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial & Multifamily, Fuel Substitution	Detailed review in progress.
SWHC038	4	Brushless Fan Motor Replacement, Residential	Detailed review in progress.
SWHC046	3	Packaged Heat Pump Air Conditioner, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Detailed review in progress.
SWLG019	1	LED, Indoor Horticulture	Measure package plan review complete. Measure package development in progress.
SWHC062	1	Occupancy Fan Controller, Commercial	Measure package plan review complete. Measure package development in progress.
SWWH027	5	Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial, Fuel Substitution	Measure package plan review in progress.
SWWH028	4	Large Heat Pump Water Heater, Commercial & Multifamily, Fuel Substitution	Measure package plan review in progress.
SWBE011	1	High Efficiency Window, Residential	Measure package plan review in progress.
SWBE012	1	High Efficiency Window, Commercial	Measure package plan review in progress.

Process Adder	EAR Metrics					
	Weight	1	2	3	4	5
SCE has continued to support the CPUC with the development of the Fuel Substitution Calculator and Refrigerant Avoided Cost Calculators. SCE has worked with E3 to provide CPUC staff assistance in review, effectiveness, and policy considerations.	1	No	No	No	+	No
SCE has continued to support the CPUC with the development of DEER tables and guidance document support. SCE has provided support in the preponderance of evidence and Title 24 guidance document development in addition to building type definitions for the Deemed Rulebook. Additionally, SCE has provided EnergyPlus support for the grocery prototype.	1	No	Yes	No	No	Yes

Attachment D: 2023 Performance Annual Ratings

Custom Scoring

2023 Annual Custom Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work Product Review Score	Disposition Score (1-5)	5.00	4.71	4.40	4.82	3.13	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	5.00	4.71	4.90	5.00	3.13	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	5.00	14.12	4.90	12.50	7.83	44.35

2022 Annual Custom Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work Product Review Score	Disposition Score (1-5)	5.00	4.22	4.40	4.41	4.25	
Review Process Score Enhancements	Technical & Policy QC Increase	0.50	0.00	1.50	0.00	0.00	
	Implementation Increase	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Score	Adjusted Final Metric Score (1-5)	5.00	4.22	5.00	4.41	4.25	Total Points
	Adjusted Metric Points	5.00	12.65	5.00	11.03	10.63	44.31

Measure Package Scoring

2023 Annual Measure Package Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work product Review Score	SCE "-"	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	SCE "+"	6%	6%	12%	12%	18%	
	SCE "Yes"	81%	94%	88%	88%	82%	
	Dispositions Score %	47%	53%	56%	56%	59%	
	Dispositions Score	2.34	2.65	2.79	2.79	2.94	
Review Process Score Enhancements	SCE "-"		0%		0%	0%	
	SCE "+"		0%		100%	0%	
	SCE "Yes"		100%		0%	100%	
	Process Score %	0%	50%	0%	100%	50%	
	Process Increase Score	0.00	2.50	0.00	5.00	2.50	
	Process Increase Weight	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	
	Process Increase Wtd Score	0.00	1.25	0.00	2.50	1.25	
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	2.34	3.90	2.79	5.00	4.19	Total Points
	Metric Points with Weighting	2.34	11.69	2.79	12.50	10.48	39.80

2022 Annual Measure Package Ratings		Metric 1	Metric 2	Metric 3	Metric 4	Metric 5	
Direct Work product Review Score	SCE "-"	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	
	SCE "+"	10%	22%	20%	8%	10%	
	SCE "Yes"	90%	70%	80%	92%	90%	
	Dispositions Score %	55%	58%	60%	54%	55%	
	Dispositions Score	2.75	2.88	3.00	2.69	2.75	
Review Process Score Enhancements	SCE "-"				0%	0%	
	SCE "+"				100%	100%	
	SCE "Yes"				0%	0%	
	Process Score %	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	
	Process Increase Score	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	
	Process Increase Weight	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	
	Process Increase Wtd Score	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.50	0.00	
Total Score	Final Metric Score (1-5)	2.75	2.88	3.00	5.00	5.00	Total Points
	Metric Points with Weighting	2.75	8.63	3.00	12.50	12.50	39.38

Explanations of scoring tables row entries

1. The row labeled with *IOU* “-“ lists the percent of Measure Package reviews undertaken where the CPUC staff evaluation of the materials or information indicated that the IOU performance in this metric for the submission did not meet minimum expectations or requirements relative to the metric.
2. The row labeled with *IOU* “+“ lists the percent of Measure Package reviews undertaken where the CPUC staff evaluation of the materials or information indicated that the IOU performance in this metric for the submission exceeded minimum expectations or requirements relative to the metric.
3. The rows labeled with *IOU* “Yes“ lists the percent of Measure Package reviews undertaken where the CPUC staff evaluation of the materials or information indicated that the IOU performance in this metric for the submission exceeded met minimum expectations or requirements relative to the metric.
4. The “Dispositions Score %” row (and “Process Increase Score” for Measure Packages) indicates how the combination of the three rows of scores (+, -, and yes) sum into a total points multiplier for each metric. Each row contributes to the total based on the row count over the total count for all three rows.
5. The “Disposition Score” (and “Process Increase Score” for Measure Packages) row converts the % score into a numeric value of up to five by directly applying the % to a value of 5.
6. The custom row labeled with “*Technical & Policy QC Increase*” lists CPUC staff points added to the metric based on an evaluation of the overall IOU performance in putting into place quality assurance and/or quality control methods, documents and/or training for staff and contractors related to this metric area that are expected to improve the ability of review personnel to identify

and cure issues going forward on projects started during 2016 but not yet seen in the custom review activity.

7. The custom row labeled with “*Implementation Increase*” lists CPUC staff points added to the metric based on an evaluation of the overall IOU performance in putting into place new or changed program rules, eligibility criteria, incentive structures, application and implementation contract processes and procedures in 2016 related to this metric area that are expected to improve performance going forward on projects started but not yet seen in the custom review activity.
8. The Measure Package rows labeled with “*Review Process Score Enhancements*” lists CPUC staff scoring for each metric based on an evaluation of the overall IOU performance in putting into place quality assurance and/or quality control methods, documents and/or training for staff and contractors that are expected to improve the ability of review personnel to identify and cure issues going forward on Measure Packages. This score is weighted as an increase to the disposition score based on the fractional weight listed in the “Process Increase Weight” row.
9. The “Final Metric Score” row indicates the total score for each metric as a sum of the Direct Work product Review Score plus the Review Process Score Enhancements (either as a simple sum for custom or a weighted value sum for Measure Packages) to provide a final metric score with the final score constrained between a maximum score of 5 and a minimum score of 1.
10. The “Metric Points” row provides the point value derived from the Final Metric Score row. If the maximum point value associated with a metric is greater than 5 then the score is multiplied by the max point value divided by 5 to obtain the metric point value related to the final score.